

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-9 remain pending in the application. By this Amendment, the specification is amended to identify the co-pending patent application number; and claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 8 are amended. No new matter is added.

In numbered paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to for informalities. To address the Examiner's concerns, the specification is amended to identify the copending application number. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In numbered paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-9 are objected to for the noted informalities. The claims are amended to address the Examiner's concerns. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In numbered paragraph 4, independent claim 1, along with various dependent claims, is rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,609,167 (Bastiani et al.). In numbered paragraph 5, dependent claim 9 is rejected as being unpatentable over the Bastiani et al. patent, in view of U.S. Patent 5,555,430 (Gephardt et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed a transceiver configured for use with a multi-tier system bus that allows for the flow of information to be managed among plural processors by connecting processors within modules on a local bus, which is then connected to the system bus by way of a gateway. As exemplified in Fig. 1, a system bus 104 controls and arbitrates access to the system bus 102 (paragraph [0013]). As exemplified in Fig. 2, a transmitter portion provides buffering and interleaved output of direct memory access and control actions packet types. A

receiver portion provides input discrimination and individual buffering of direct memory access and interrupt control actions packets along with specialized control functions, e.g., reset, timer, broadcast, etc.

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claim 1, which recites, among other features, a transceiver for use within a multi-tier system bus configuration, including means for independently receiving instructions via the system bus from one or more devices connected to the system bus, means for independently transmitting instructions via the system bus to one or more devices connected to the system bus, means for buffering instructions received via the system bus, and means for buffering instructions transmitted via the system bus, wherein access to the multi-tier system bus is arbitrated.

The Bastiani et al. patent discloses a packet generator/decoder 358 that sends and receives data packets to and from a connected device. As shown in Fig. 41, the packet generator/decoder is common for both send and receive, and the Tx/Rx functions 372 are individualized per device connection. Accordingly, the Bastiani et al. patent does not teach or suggest a transceiver for use within a multi-tier system bus configuration, wherein there are means for independently receiving instructions, means for independently transmitting instructions, means for buffering received instructions, and means for buffering transmitted instructions. Further, the Bastiani et al. relates to individual Tx/Rx connections to respective devices, but does not suggest connections to a system bus, wherein access to the multi-tier system bus is arbitrated. Claim 1 is therefore allowable.

The Gephardt et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Bastiani et al. patent. The Gephardt et al. patent was applied for its disclosure of interrupt

management in a multiprocessing system (col. 22, line 61 through col. 23, line 17).

However, the Gephardt et al. patent does not teach or suggest a transceiver for use within a multi-tier system bus configuration, wherein there are, among other features, means for independently receiving instructions, means for independently transmitting instructions, means for buffering received instructions, and means for buffering transmitted instructions, as recited in claim 1. Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, at least for these reasons, claim 9 is allowable.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1 and 9 are allowable. The remaining claims depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 13, 2005

By:   
Reg. No. 48,360

Patrick C. Keane

Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620